

introduced on April 24. It was referred directly to General File, Mr. President. I do have committee amendments pending by the Appropriations Committee. Those amendments are on page 1862.

**SPEAKER BARRETT:** Senator Warner, on the committee amendments.

**SENATOR WARNER:** Mr. President, members of the Legislature, LB 787, as it was introduced, does one thing. It reappropriates the unexpended balances on the grants from the oil overcharge funds that were contained in LB 449, excuse me, 432, and it is necessary that 787 be passed so that those funds are reappropriated in the event, in which the likely event, of course, that all the projects currently approved by the Legislature can proceed, and the money, obviously, would not be expended by June 30th. In addition though, then the committee amendment, in order to provide the Legislature with the opportunity to affirmatively with 25 votes appropriate the funds for two other projects, we are offering this as a committee amendment, and the obvious thing is the position the Legislature is in is that it takes 25 votes to affirm rather than 25 votes to take it out. So it is to make it clear that there is that opportunity. The amendment has two grants involved. It is an agricultural grant, approximately \$2 million. Of that, a million and a half goes to one of the previously approved applications and approximately 500,000 to the other application. The 500,000 one, I guess, we generally refer to as Hastings Pork, and the million and a half is the one that we generally refer to as Valmont. The original request in the case of Valmont, as you will recall, was \$3 million. Under the provisions of agreeing to the contract that was approved by the previous administration through those negotiations, why the Valmont amount was reduced down to the million and a half rather than 3 million, and the one with Hastings Pork stays, essentially, at the same dollar amount as was originally requested, or approximately so, at least. In the case...there is, I believe, a request, Mr. President, with a motion on the desk to separate these two issues and I will proceed in my explanation on the assumption that when that is given to...when that amendment or request to divide the question is provided that that is what will occur. I will speak to the Valmont project first. There are a number of points that might be used. As will you recall, the federal guidelines, the court decree did limit as to what these oil overcharge funds could be used for, and this particular project, in the case of Valmont, has been modified from the original grant request, and, in its present